

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action of 11/15/2006. This request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that the claims 1-10 and 12-25 were allowable.

CLAIM, SPECIFICATION, AND ABSTRACT AMENDMENTS

All amendments made herein are minor corrections for clarification purpose and translation errors. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 11 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The examiner suggested that the specification fails to disclose that the sensor can sense the metal or magnetic material by the material touching the sensor, which is the CCD image device, and that it also fails to disclose how an image of an object can indicate that the object is metal or magnetic material. In addition, the Examiner stated that the specification fails to disclose how a capacitance sensor senses the sharpness of the metal or magnetic material.

Claims 11 and 26 were rejected under the same section by saying that Claim 11 is not clear as to how the metal or magnetic material can be sensed by it touching the sensor, which is the CCD image device, how the capacitance sensor can sense the

sharpness of the metal or magnetic material, and how the metal or magnetic material's location is detected based on the capacitance value that depends on the metal or magnetic material's sharpness.

First of all, to avoid further different perceptions toward the same words or phrases, the Applicant changed all “metal or magnetic material” to “article made of metal or magnetic”.

Appreciating the reference US2004/0194594 given by Julie Lieu, also to give better and distinct expression for the capacitance sensor, we have changed the “ a capacitance sensor that shows capacitance values depending on metal or magnetic material's sharpness or distance, so as to detect metal or magnetic material's location” to “ a capacitance sensor that shows capacitance values varying with respect to the distance between the article made of metal or magnetic and the sensor so that location of the article made of metal or magnetic can be determined”.

The CCD sensor is used to detect the shape of article made of metal or magnetic, instead of detecting the material that is used to fabricate such article. The image detected by the CCD sensor will be compared with data base and once the pre-determined shape is found a signal will be sent.

The capacitance sensor in the present invention, also according to the reference patent given, is used to determine the distance between the article made of metal or magnetic and the capacitance sensor with respect to the varying values read by the capacitance sensor, then further can be used to determine the location of the article made of metal or magnetic.

All the rest of the corrections in the specification should be sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejection on these points.

Conclusion

Since no major changes in the content was made in the claims, specification, and abstract and the amendments were solely for the purpose of clarification and correction of the translation, the Examiner's conditional allowance to Claims 1-10 and 12-25 should remain the same. Also, it is respectfully submitted Claims 11 and 26 are now in condition for allowance because of the amendments made to comply with the Examiner's suggestion, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

/TRACY M HEIMS/

Tracy M Heims

Reg. # 53,010

Apex Juris, pllc

12360 Lake City Way Northeast, Suite 410

Seattle, Washington 98125

Phone: 206-664-0314

Fax: 206-664-0329

Email: tracy@apexjuris.com